## EXHIBIT 8

Pages 1 - 23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Vince Chhabria, Judge

IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC. CONSUMER)
PRIVACY USER PROFILE LITIGATION.) NO. 18-MD-02843 VC

San Francisco, California Thursday, June 24, 2021

TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM WEBINAR PROCEEDINGS OF THE OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING - 2:22 - 2:48 p.m.

## APPEARANCES VIA ZOOM:

For Plaintiffs:

KELLER ROHRBACK LLP

1201 Third Avenue - Suite 3200

Seattle, Washington 98101

BY: DEREK LOESER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

CARI LAUFENBERG, ATTORNEY AT LAW

DAVID J. KO, ATTORNEY AT LAW

BLEICHMAR, FONTI & AULD LLP 555 12th Street - Suite 1600

Oakland, California 94607

BY: LESLEY E. WEAVER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

ANNE K. DAVIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

MATTHEW P. MELAMED, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

Transcribed By: Marla F. Knox, RPR, CRR, RMR

United States Official Court Reporter

Judge Corley, and I'm sure it's intensely frustrating for you.

Judge Corley came up with what I thought all of the parties thought was a very good idea to try to deal with some of these issues, which was to have us voluntarily agree to discovery mediation.

Frankly, that is something that none of us had ever really attempted before; but in my several -- almost three decades of litigating cases like this, I have never seen discovery have so many problems before.

And so we were willing to try this. And, in fact, it has been quite helpful. Judge Andler and Mr. Garrie have done an outstanding job attempting to bring the parties together.

I would say from the Plaintiffs' perspective the problem -- again, I'm sure Mr. Snyder will disagree -- but mediation doesn't do a great job of dealing with the situation where one side is convinced the other side is utterly incorrect, and there needs to be some type of ruling to move the matter forward.

And so what we have seen is there are some limitations to what -- in that type of situation -- what mediation can resolve.

We have a solution that we think would really solve that problem, and we think would really accelerate the pace of discovery.

And that would be to add a special master -- particularly

a special master who is very familiar with the technological issues in a case like this and to have that person able to call some balls and strikes.

So we would like to modify the structure Judge Corley has set up -- which, again, we fully support -- by introducing the ability for a technical special master to simply look at the parties -- having heard them; having seen whatever attempt to mediate the issues, if the parties so choose to attempt it that way -- and to call some balls and strikes.

Mr. Garrie, who has served in that exact capacity before is perfectly suited for that. He has already been selected by the parties. He has the mutual support of the parties to be a mediator for discovery. And we think if we can simply evolve his role so he can look the parties in the eye after listening to them and say: Look, you are wrong. You are right or there is some solution there and I order it, that can then go to Judge Corley. If the parties want to challenge that decision, they can.

I'm hopeful that they won't and that we won't and that Facebook won't. And then if there is some further need to appeal that on, so be it. That's usually how it works.

THE COURT: Well, that's -- that last part is the part that I have a problem with.

I mean, I think that what you are contemplating now is a -- a scenario where there are basically three levels of

Mr. Garrie as our special masters. The parties mutually selected Judge Andler. She obviously is an esteemed 20-plus-year mediator with JAMS and before that, one of the most respected judges in the commercial division, I think, in Santa Barbara.

And she brought in as a technical expert, Mr. Garrie, who is also incredibly talented. He understands the technology.

Judge Andler has been a judge and a mediator for many years and has incredible judicial temperament and judgment on these issues and has been calling balls and strikes without authority and very, very helpful in mediating disputes.

And so we would consent -- we think they both would be excellent if it works because one is the Judge. The other is the technical. And they compare notes and come to a consensus in their rulings or determinations.

And it also helps as a tag-team because they are both very busy, Your Honor. So one is available for an hour. Another one is available for the other hour, and then they come back for the last half hour.

So as a tag-team, we think they make an excellent special master. And given some of the technical issues, it is very helpful to have someone with that technical background if not judicial background.

We would agree, Your Honor, to their rulings being final and not appealable to anyone; to save you and Judge Corley time

and preserve your scarce resources.

We would be happy with any level of appellate review to Your Honor or Judge Corley that the Plaintiffs wish, and we would consent to either. And we believe that giving them that final authority.

We would also agree to a cost shifting on an appeal; losing party, to dissuade even further appeals. Because contrary to what I think Your Honor may believe respectfully, we really are not in the dispute manufacturing business. We are in the, Let's get to class cert. Let's get to summary judgment. Let's get this case on the road.

And, unfortunately, there are irreconcilable disputes about the scope of discovery.

And Judge Andler and Mr. Garrie understand the case,
Your Honor, as well as the parties do. They know every
in-and-out of the case by now, which is an incredibly helpful
resource to have.

So we think we can efficiently and effectively bring all the disputes to them. Again, we are happy for it to be final under Rule 53, I think -- I think Your Honor has discretion to order that. That's how much trust and faith we have in these two mediators/referees/special masters.

So whatever Your Honor and the Plaintiffs wish in terms of review, we are happy to consent to it so long as it is both of them because it's been a very effective and successful process.

reach agreement on that. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. I think --MR. LOESER: Your Honor --3 THE COURT: Sorry. Go ahead. 4 I was just going to say, we obviously --5 MR. LOESER: confidentiality is important in mediation. That's well 6 understood by all the parties. 7 I think the one thing that is a little nuance here -- that 8 I think the parties are going to have to work through -- is 9 10 because it is discovery mediation and because we do need to 11 inform the Court of the status of discovery disputes and we do need to be able to argue for the position that we want to take, 12 regardless of whether we mediated it, it is not going to be the 13 same type of confidentiality that you would see in the 14 15 settlement mediation context where, you know, the parties can 16 agree not to say anything about what happened in mediation 17 because --18 THE COURT: And I will just say that I haven't seen --19 you know, in the stuff that I have read that you-all have 20 submitted in anticipation of this conference, I haven't seen 21 anything that I think anybody could reasonably describe as objectionable or a breach or anything like that. 22 23 But -- and I also think that, you know, the issue of confidentiality, when we are talking about mediating discovery 24

disputes, is just so much less of a big deal. It just doesn't

25

seem like a big deal at all to me. But that may be -- reflect my lack of sophistication on these matters.

So I would like to do, if it is okay with everybody, is think about it a little more and, perhaps, have an off-line discussion with Judge Andler and Mr. Garrie and Judge Corley. And then I will issue an order after doing that.

MR. LOESER: That's excellent, Your Honor. And if we could start -- go back to where we started on this call, which is to just very briefly talk about the settlement mediation.

THE COURT: Yeah, that's what I have been wanting to talk about.

MR. LOESER: Right. I figured you would want us to address that. We do appreciate your suggestion that the parties consider that.

And the parties have agreed on a mediator and -- unless

Orin tells me right now I'm not supposed to say who it is -- I

think we can tell you who it is. It is Judge -- former Judge

Gandhi. We are working with him on dates.

THE COURT: Cool.

MR. LOESER: He has indicated availability in September and October. The parties are going to talk about those dates. And I do think this is going to be one of those situations where it is very important that the litigation --

THE COURT: You don't want to get former Judge Grewal to do it?